REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-19 are presented for further consideration. Claims 1, 10 and 11 are independent claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over *Jepsen, et al.* (US Patent Publication 2005/075386). For at least the reasons set forth herein, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-19 are patentable over the applied art. Applicants amendments to claims 1, 10 and 11 are in no-way to be construed as a concession regarding all previous rejections.

At the outset, Applicants rely at least on the following standards with regard to proper rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Notably, a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. *See, e.g., W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Anticipation requires that each and every element of the claimed invention be disclosed in a single prior art reference. *See, e.g., In re Paulsen,* 30 F.3d 1475, 31 USPQ2d 1671 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Alternatively, anticipation requires that each and every element of the claimed invention be embodied in a single prior art device or practice. *See, e.g., Minnesota Min. & Mfg. Co. v. Johnson & Johnson Orthopaedics, Inc.*, 976 F.2d 1559, 24 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 1992). For anticipation, there must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention. *See, e.g., Scripps Clinic & Res. Found. v. Genentech, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565, 18 USPQ2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

i. Claims 1 and 10

Claim 1 is drawn to a decentralized power generation system, and features:

a plurality of DC/DC converters, wherein each of said DC/DC converters is connected to another one of said power generating units and, ***when a voltage supplied from a respective power generating units meets or exceeds a threshold voltage****, the associated DC/DC converter is configured to convert a current provided by said power generating units*

Claim 10 includes similar features.

Applicants respectfully submit that the noted features of claims 1 and 10 are not disclosed in the applied art. To wit, a review of the applied art reveals the concern with preventing a solar cell from collapsing if a DC/DC converter is allowed to draw more current than it is able to deliver (see for instance, paragraphs [0018] and [0019] for example). There is no disclosure, however, of setting a threshold voltage and conversion by a DC/DC converter only if this threshold is met or exceeded as specifically claimed.

For at least the noted reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied art fails to disclose at least one feature of each of claims 1 and 10. Therefore, an in accordance with common law standards noted in the Rule 111 Reply, a *prima facie* case of anticipation cannot be established based on *Jepsen, et al.* Therefore, claims 1 and 10 are patentable over the applied art. Moreover, claims 2-9, which depend from claim 1, are also patentable over the applied art for at least the same reasons.

ii. Claim 11

Claim 11 also features converting a current ***when a voltage supplied from a respective power generating units meets or exceeds a threshold voltage***. Thus, and for at least the reasons set forth above, *Jepsen, et al.* fails to disclose at least one feature of claim 11. As such, because the applied art fails to disclose at least one feature of claim 11, a *prima facie* case of anticipation cannot be established based on *Jepsen, et al.* Therefore, claim 11 is patentable over the applied art. Moreover, claims 12-19, which depend from claim 11, are also patentable over the applied art for at least the same reasons.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The claims rejected under this section of the Code depend variously from one of claims 1, 10 or 11, which are patentable over the applied art for at least the reasons set forth above. Thus, and while in no way conceding the propriety of these rejections, Applicants submit that the rejections are moot in view of the patentability of claims 1, 10 and 11.

Conclusion

In view the foregoing, applicant(s) respectfully request(s) that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance.

If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of:
Phillips Electronics North America Corp.

s/William S. Francos/

by: William S. Francos (Reg. No. 38,456)
Date: October 17, 2008

Volentine & Whitt, PLLC
Two Meridian Blvd.
Wyomissing, PA 19610
(610) 375-3513 (v)
(610) 375-3277 (f)